

REMARKS

The Official Action dated August 25, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully noted. In view thereof, the drawings, specification and claims have been amended in order to better define that which Applicants regard as the invention. As previously, claims 1-4 are presently pending in the instant application.

Initially, Applicants wish to acknowledge the Examiner's indication on page 3 of the Office Action, that claims 1-4 are allowable over the prior art of record and merely objected to as containing minor informalities and would therefore be allowable if rewritten to overcome the objections set forth in the Official Action. In this regard, as can be seen from the foregoing amendments, claims 1, 3 and 4 have been amended in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are now in proper formal condition for allowance.

With reference now to paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the drawings have been objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5) because they include reference characters not mentioned in the specification. Namely, the Examiner notes that the specification fails to refer to reference numerals 21 and 6A.

With respect to reference numeral 21, filed concurrently herewith are substitute formal drawings wherein the reference numeral 21 has been removed from Figs. 2, 3, 4 and 6. Additionally, reference numeral 19 erroneously set forth in Fig. 1 has been removed. With respect to reference numeral 6A, the Examiner's attention is directed to paragraph 35, line 4 of Applicants' specification wherein reference numeral 6A is set forth. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the drawings properly include reference numeral 6A which is referred to in Applicants' specification.


Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner enter and fully consider the substitute formal drawings as presented by the Applicants.

With reference to paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the specification has been objected to as including minor informalities. Again, as can be seen from the foregoing amendments, the specification has been amended in the manner suggested by the Examiner and consequently is now believed to be in proper formal condition for allowance.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing it is respectfully requested that the objections of record be reconsidered and withdrawn by the Examiner, that claims 1-4 be allowed and that the application be passed to issue.

Should the Examiner believe a conference would be of benefit in expediting the prosecution of the instant application, he is hereby invited to telephone counsel to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,



Donald R. Studebaker
Reg. No. 32,815

Nixon Peabody LLP
401 9th Street N.W.
Suite 900
Washington, D. C. 20004
(202) 585-8000